	G6L5murC conference	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	ETHAN MURPHY, et al.,	
4	Plaintiffs,	
5	v.	13 Civ. 6503 (RJS)
6	PHILIPPE LAJAUNIE, et al.,	
7	Defendants.	
8	x	
9		June 21, 2016 3:45 p.m.
10	Before:	5.45 p.m.
11	HON. RICHARD J. SULLIVAN,	
12		District Judge
13	APPEARANCES	
14	JOSEPH, HERZFELD, HESTER & KIRSCHENBAUM Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
15	BY: DANIEL M. KIRSCHENBAUM -and-	
16	JEFFREY E. GOLDMAN	
17	KAUFMAN, DOLOWITCH & VOLUCK, LLP Attorneys for Defendants	
18	BY: JEFFERY A. MEYER AARON N. SOLOMON	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
25		

G6L5murC conference

1 (Case called) 2 THE COURT: Let's take appearances. For the 3 plaintiff? 4 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Daniel M. Kirschenbaum. Good 5 afternoon, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Kirschenbaum, good afternoon. 7 MR. GOLDMAN: Jeffrey Goldman for the plaintiff. THE COURT: Mr. Goldman, good afternoon to you. 8 9 And for the defendants? 10 MR. MEYER: Jeffrey Meyer and Aaron Solomon. 11 THE COURT: We have Mr. LaJaunie. 12 MR. FERRARI: I'm Robert Ferrari. I am here -- I am 13 an attorney. I am here as a consultant to Mr. LaJaunie on the 14 motion to be relieved as counsel. 15 THE COURT: What does that mean to be a consultant? MR. FERRARI: Pardon me? 16 17 THE COURT: What does it mean to be a consultant? 18 MR. FERRARI: If he has any problems he is going to 19 speak on his own about why he thinks the bills are not proper. 20 If he has any problem, he will turn to me and ask me a 21 question. 22 THE COURT: Well, I will let you sit there but 23 obviously you are not counsel of record. Is there a plan to

make you counsel of record at some point?

MR. FERRARI: I'm sorry, sir?

24

25

THE COURT: Is there plan to make you counsel of record at some point?

MR. FERRARI: Maybe. Maybe not. I don't know yet. I don't know that I want to be counsel of record.

THE COURT: Everybody, have a seat.

MR. FERRARI: He has attorneys now that have so-called spent \$200,000 of his insurance money. He thinks that they were overset spent that they weren't entitled to the \$200,000.

THE COURT: That's not really the issue today. So, have a seat.

So, we are here because of defense counsel's request or motion to be relieved, based on non-payment, and then I have a letter from plaintiff opposing that request arguing that to relieve counsel at this point would effectively scuttle the trial date that's been set and the pretrial submission dates that have been set for some time. Another thing that is supposed to happen in the short-term is that defendants are supposed to produce a list of class members with addresses or contact numbers. And then there is supposed to be notice that goes out to those folks quickly since I think we are already behind schedule on that.

So, we have got a full plate of things that are supposed to be happening and so I guess the question is is relieving counsel going to -- is it going to affect that schedule.

So, let me ask -- I am not sure you can answer that question.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Your Honor, I just want to, before defendants — just to clarify our position. We are much more concerned with the schedule remaining on pace including the class notice going out and outstanding documents being turned over now than how defendants decide they want to represent themselves in the long run.

THE COURT: Well, that's fine, but I mean there is a number of things that are supposed to be happening, only one of which is the class list and -- well, are you referring to discovery materials?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Your Honor ordered the defendants to turn over a whole series of documents by June 16th. It is not clear to us why defendants still haven't turned those over, but in the order that's filed on the docket is no. 219, which I believe was issued shortly after our last conference before your Honor there is a whole bunch of stuff they were supposed to turn over so that we could stay on track to have our September trial and none of that has been turned over.

THE COURT: So, let me hear from the defendant on that. What is the story with the materials that are out of time?

MR. SOLOMON: Judge, we are fully prepared to address the discovery issues as well as our motion but we are going to

conference

respectfully request that we be permitted to explain the situation, in camera, as it relates to attorney-client privilege.

THE COURT: There is nothing privileged about whether or when these materials that I have ordered to be produced are going to be produced.

MR. SOLOMON: Part of it has to deal with -- it is another basis for our application to withdraw.

THE COURT: I am going to deny that. I am going to deny that application subject to renewal later, but where are the materials?

MR. MEYER: Your Honor, as we discussed at the last conference, we advised the that the restaurant now, there is only one functioning restaurant, one operating restaurant; the Park Avenue location closed. Les Halles is working on a skeleton crew in the admin office. We have attempted to work with the client, Mr. LaJaunie and they have done everything they can to get us that information. However, the depth and breadth of it and the limited resources available to the defendant, the corporate defendant, have made that impossible.

We have not yet received those documents. It is one individual that is employed there who, in addition to trying to wind down the one restaurant merge it with the second with one, keep the second document a flight has not been.

THE COURT: So the Court Order, hey, that's just

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conference

The Court should understand that there is other things least. going on and if we are fifth or sixth on the priority list we should be pleased.

So, what? Am I just to sanction defendants every day that they don't produce these things? Do you think that will make them rise up the list? Put your hand down. Put your hand down.

MR. MEYER: Your Honor, we have tried everything we can to get these documents. We have spoken -- we have kept up relationship with the defendants, rapport with them about the documents. We have just not received them yet.

THE COURT: So that sounds like contempt to me so -- I mean, I am not going to let you out of this case just because you are not getting paid because I'm getting totally dissed here.

So, if I am going to endure this pain then you can sure as hell believe you are going to endure it too and I am not going to have the plaintiffs bear the cost of this. So, that's not happening. So, I guess the issue then is what is it going to take to make defendants comply with Court orders. So, what is it going to take? \$10,000 a day? Do you think a fine of \$10,000 a day? Do you think that would result in compliance

MR. MEYER: Your Honor, I would hope we would be able to comply without contempt and without penalty.

THE COURT: Well, let's just sort of go through this

again. I issued an Order on April 15th that set dates for these things to be produced and they haven't been produced.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: And, your Honor, defendants did ask for a stay since then and got rejected.

THE COURT: Yes.

So, in any event, it seems to me that the only thing to do now is to see if there are other ways to compel compliance. I guess the last resort would be to grant judgment against the defendants for ignoring Court orders. That's a last resort and I don't think we need to go there today, at least I hope not. I plan to try some other things first but I really do not intend to just let people ignore my orders because they're more interested in other things.

So, Mr. LaJaunie seems to want to say something.

MR. FERRARI: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Mr. LaJaunie seems to want to say something.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

There is one and I apologize for the lack of proper cooperation, but the situation we are in now is the consequence of what has happened when Mr. Goldman took a court document and sent it to my staff of the larger of the two restaurant, Les Halles, the original one for 45 years, and he circulated a motion of — is it a motion or some eviction document that was a — it tore at my negotiation with the landlord when they were

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

renegotiating the lease after 25 years and a new landlord who obviously, the effect of circulating this eviction document which was not an eviction process, it was part of our negotiation with the landlord was that my staff walked out. And when this happened then the restaurant seized operation just as I was trying to finalize the lease for negotiation. We were already four months after the end of the lease and we had to vacate the restaurant in 10 days with no staff. 10 days and no staff.

The consequence of that is that physically -- forget the staff walking away with wine and liquor and equipment and so forth, the consequence of Mr. Goldman's action is that we had to vacate the restaurant that had been open for 25 years that was full of all the documents we had for this process and it was dumped with chairs and kitchen equipment and everything and dozens if not hundreds of boxes of documents.

I have lost all my staff. I have only new staff but one person who belonged to the old office. We are trying to stay open with the smaller restaurant that we have left and it is going to take, as I said immediately, it is going to take months to even find the boxes because everything is literally a pile of wet, stinky garbage. That's what we are dealing with.

So, there is no bad intention. There is no -- there is nothing other than we are trying to even find the documents and I don't know how these things work. I am trying my best to

conference

move things and I have this one person who is the only one left to know how to administrate one restaurant and find these documents.

At this point, it is just time. We need time. I have three woks and one hot plate. I don't know how to act faster. We could not -- the website for the restaurant stayed as is for -- until last week. I didn't have \$2,000 to have someone take the old restaurant down. Now at least it doesn't talk about the second restaurant.

So, beyond personnel there is a lack of cash, there is a lack of everything to accomplish promptly and following the schedule, the Court Order.

As a side note, I would like to say I had requested from the beginning three years ago that I would be advised of every hearing, every court, even if it were just a quick scheduling hearing. I was not informed of the hearing last time when all of this was decided although I was in town and I would have voiced all my concern at the time and hopefully be heard about what was possible and have a different calendar.

The calendar is just not -- we cannot accomplish this Court Order as it was ordered.

THE COURT: I guess I'm not persuaded. So, I ordered on April 15th a list -- a class list in Excel format was to be produced by June 1st and I am told that that's not been done, that there are a bunch of documents that are wet, stinky

G6L5murC conference

garbage that nobody has gone through and nobody is capable of 1 2 going through. 3 That's basically what you are telling me. 4 THE DEFENDANT: No. 5 THE COURT: No? 6 THE DEFENDANT: If I may, your Honor, I am saying it 7 is going to take a long time to go through everything and produce one by one all the names and whatever documents needs 8

THE COURT: Okay.

to be produced.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: What I was saying is compared to having --

THE COURT: And I am hearing about that on June 21st even though it was due on June 1st and I ordered it on April 15th.

THE DEFENDANT: And I should have been here on April 15th and I was not made aware of the hearing and when I was made aware of the hearing the Court order, that was the Court order.

THE COURT: No, no. This hearing was scheduled after I got a letter from your lawyer saying they wanted to withdraw. That's when we scheduled this hearing.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Production of documents was ordered back in April, so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: And I voiced to my lawyers immediately that it was going to take months and months and months to produce exactly all of these documents. The time before we were very diligent, very active, perfectly on time to produce every document. At the time I had two restaurants, I had four people in the office plus two interns who I had hired just for that matter, meaning the request of the production -- document production.

THE COURT: Okay. So, how long are you telling me this is going to take?

THE DEFENDANT: It is going to take months, your Honor.

> THE COURT: Months.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: Months is what you are telling me?

THE DEFENDANT: Months, several months, many months. And I expect that once we get everything organized that things are going to, you know, at least are going to get things going but right now it is just even finding and organizing the documents that we need to provide the information requested.

THE COURT: I want to be clear about the documents we are talking about. What was ordered to be produced by June 1st was an Excel spreadsheet that includes the names of all the class members, the last known addresses and locations for those people, the dates of employment for each individual at each

G6L5murC conference

restaurant and the names of the positions that they held.

That's what we are talking about, right?

There was then contemplation of post-certification discovery but that was going to be after the list was produced and notice went out on class certification. And so, there was also an order that eight opt-in plaintiffs who had not yet provided interrogatories and documents would do so by June 1st and that's happened?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

MR. SOLOMON: There are some opt-in plaintiffs who didn't respond. We are going to deal with that in course.

THE COURT: So, I will hear from plaintiffs as to what they propose we do in light of what Mr. LaJaunie has just said.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Your Honor, defendants have representation by counsel right now. They had representation on April 19th. They were here present in the same room as me when this discussion happened about what documents would need to be produced. They chose not to alert your Honor to anything until the day before the class list was due.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: And on that date they asked for a stay and had it rejected.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: So, even if Mr. LaJaunie himself is having a manpower issue, there are people in this world that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

could get this information in accordance with your Honor's April 15th order.

THE COURT: Probably. I would say there probably are people in this world who could do it.

What are you proposing?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: I propose that defendants be given until after the weekend to get us all the documents that your Honor ordered and the class list that your Honor ordered so that we could keep the trial date as planned and if they don't, they would be subject to appropriate sanctions.

THE COURT: And if then it sounds like they certainly won't be able to do that, at least based on what's been represented, then sanctions of what? It is not supposed to be punitive, it is supposed to be something that is going to compel compliance so what would that be?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: One question we have to ask ourselves is are defendants essentially setting up the Park Avenue corporation for default because if they are, why should we have to go through the pain of chasing our tails the next three months? If they can't get the documents, the lawyers don't want to represent them, they don't want to spend the manpower to do what your Honor wants, then that entity could be held in contempt and punished with a default and the remaining entities could move on to a trial on their end of the liability. Mr. LaJaunie has some FLSA liability and the John

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Street location is still in operation.

THE COURT: So, in other words you are saying if they don't comply in short order with the April 15th order that then I would enter a default. That's what you are saying?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

I would like to point out that a MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: lot of the documents also relate to the John Street location. It is conceivable that defendants stored documents for John Street also in Park Avenue and those documents are also wet and stinky but a lot of these documents are payroll records that ADP presumably has or that exist electronically as well; for example, tip sheets, year end payroll reports, etc.

I mean, if the only way defendants could produce them is in a wet format we will figure out what to do with them but payroll records are something that, A, even at the Park Avenue location should be easily locateable; B, may exist electronically; and C, with the John Street records which we don't have.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask counsel, without revealing client confidences, what steps have you taken to comply with the April 15th order concerning the class list and the information required?

MR. MEYER: Your Honor, we have asked repeatedly via e-mail, via phone call, multiple correspondence in many, many

25

15

fashions with Yoko and Mr. LaJaunie that we must get this 1 information produced. If the Court will recall, the last April 2 3 conference we were here, while the entire window was set at 4 that point there was no way -- we were told at that point, I 5 believe we asked for 120 days from effectively May 1 which was 6 shorted to the June 1 deadline. We have done everything we can 7 to try to get this information from our client. We do not know where it exists. We don't know what format it exists in. 8 9 don't have access to it. If we did, we would produce it. 10 don't have. THE COURT: You don't have access to it. You don't 11 12 have access to going to the location where these documents are 13 stored? 14 MR. MEYER: We don't know what form these documents 15 are in. 16 THE COURT: Mr. LaJaunie said they're in boxes and 17 they're wet. 18 MR. MEYER: That's the first we are hearing of it. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 Mr. LaJaunie? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Thank you, your 22 Honor. 23 The main office at the time when two restaurants was 24 at Park Avenue so all the records were there and everything was

moved with truckloads of restaurant equipment so everything is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at 50 John Street and hence the condition of the documents.

I am not saying they are destroyed, I am not saying we cannot find them, I am saying that everything is mixed and sometime has pulled open entire cases of documents and at this point I do not have the resources -- monetary or staff -- to go through these documents in an educated way knowing what to look for and do it fast. That's what it is.

So, no, at this point I cannot hire two people who are going to know exactly where to find it and where to find it and to put all of this together.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Could I point out one thing, your Honor?

THE COURT: Well, let him finish.

Go ahead. Are you finished?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Have a set.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Were these documents moved before April 15th or April 15th? On April 15th your Honor made an order to turn over the documents. Did someone get them wet after your Honor ordered them to be produced? Or, if they were already wet when your Honor ordered them to be produced, somebody between April 15th and today should have told us about this. It just makes no sense.

THE COURT: Well, it is curious, I will say that. so, Mr. LaJaunie, what was the state of these documents in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

April as of April 15th when I issued the order?

Right. The restaurant closed on March THE DEFENDANT: 30th, so everything has happened -- all of this precipitation or panic mode happened at the end of March, and since the hearing of that I was not made aware of, I have told Mr. Meyer that this is the situation and this is going to take months and months and months to go through all of this.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Look. It is not going to take months and months and months. I am not going to let it take months and months and months. If what you are telling me is I have the choice of giving you months and months and months to do this on your schedule or to basically issue a default judgment against you, that's an easy question for me, I will just issue a default judgment against you, against the corporate client or clients. I may also allow, although I previously denied this request, I may also allow the plaintiffs to amend the complaint to name Mr. LaJaunie on the state claims I mean I dismissed those claims because of what I as well. think were omissions or failures to include certain facts in the 56.1 statements but if I think that this is really just an effort to render a corporate defendants judgment-proof and to leave plaintiffs sort of just with nothing but an empty judgment, then it seems to me it may be in everybody's interest and certainly in the interest of justice to allow individual defendants to be included in additional counts for additional

time.

So, it just seems to me that defendants clearly don't consider this to be a high priority, there are other things they consider to be much higher priorities and that they can't or won't comply with the Court order.

I am just not that moved since the Court order was issued two and a half months ago and this is the first I am hearing of these kinds of problems. So, I think I am going to do a variation on what Mr. Kirschenbaum has requested which is I will give you another week to get this wrapped up but after that then I am going to sanction defendants for not complying with a two and a half month old order, and one of the possible sanctions will be dismissal for failure to comply with court orders.

I think that the goal here is to having not successfully gotten me to stay this action or to extend the period in which these things were going to happen, it seems as though the decision was made, well, we are just not going to comply and then Court will have no choice but to grant us the stay that was originally denied and that ain't happening. That was a bad strategy if that was the strategy.

MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if I can address the stay?

The stay was included in our letter to afford

Mr. LaJaunie time to find new counsel and to handle these

matters as we have not been --

THE COURT: Right, which weeks --

MR. MEYER: It wasn't a strategy with Mr. LaJaunie, it was a strategy in order for us -- it wasn't a strategy. It was a request --

THE COURT: Well, my point is maybe the strategy was to stop complying with Court orders, to stop responding to requests from counsel, to stop paying counsel all in an effort to frankly just buy time in which to render the corporate defendants judgment-proof. I'm not making that finding but I am saying that that's certainly a possibility that leaps to mind on these facts and that's not going to be a winning strategy. I'm not going to let it be.

So, to the extent there is a request to be relieved as counsel, that's denied. And to the extent that there is a request for me to extend the June 1st deadline for several months, what has been described so for and months and months, that's also denied. I will give you a week to get in compliance with the Court's order and if that hasn't happened by then, then I am going to sanction the defendants for not complying. Okay? And I think it will probably be in the neighborhood of something like \$5,000 a day or \$10,000 a day. We will see if that works. And if that doesn't work, then I think I will have no choice but to enter a default judgment because, clearly, people are not complying with court orders and the goal is just to disrupt a litigation that's been going

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on for years -- literally years -- and for which there is a trial date that's already been set.

So, I will memorialize that in a minute entry.

Mr. LaJaunie?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, the restaurant -- first of all, there is no strategy, no plan, or anything. At this point we are trying to stay open. We are behind the rent about a hundred thousand dollars, that's tree months of rent and various taxes and this and that. Every day is a struggle. cannot explain unless I would have a camera to take pictures and show them in court, I cannot explain what the daily management of this remaining restaurant is. I could not sustain another day in what was in penalty, fines. And I am saying this as plainly as I can, nothing is going to be possible in one week.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: It is just not going to be possible and the result is that it is going to close the second restaurant and, again, and eliminate all possibilities of -- I mean, I thought the end of the game was to pay their fees, number one, and then what there is left for the plaintiffs. would like to discuss the certification of the class action which has no merit and I can prove that if given the opportunity.

I would like to discuss the four thoughts of this

action, these proceedings, and show the Court that one was entirely manufactured. The first one the maître d'issue is non-existent because systematically --

THE COURT: Look. If you want to fight this on the merits, that's great. That's why I have a trial date. What I have asked you to produce is not terribly onerous. It is information about the people who work there who would be members of a class who are entitled to notice going forward. It is not that onerous. I issued an order on April 15th that gave what I considered to be plenty of time to do that. You keep telling me that it just isn't possible. I just don't buy it. I mean, maybe you are unfamiliar with how litigation works but the reality is is that there are cases in this court house involving millions of pages of documents and it gets done and there are ways to get it done.

So, it seems to me what you are saying is that between various choices you've made the choice to not litigate this case between working on the other restaurant, between doing whatever else you think you need to do to maintain whatever holdings you have. That's your first priority and I guess that's your choice, but the consequences of that choice will be, ultimately, I think, a default judgment. And if what you are telling me today is you have no intention of complying with the order that I'm about to issue, which is that you need to comply with my prior order within a week, then maybe we should

just go straight to default. Right? I mean, is there any point in just dragging this out?

It seems to me what Mr. LaJaunie has said to me is that he is really not planning to seriously try to comply with the order I would issue today and if that's the case, I think that representation should be enough for me to then enter a default.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, there is absolutely no intention. I am describing consequences of what was triggered by Mr. Goldman. This restaurant was supposed to close two weeks ago and we managed to stay open with -- and I am not going to describe how we get supplies and everything -- this was going to close one week or the other. If you want me to respond to your question, very dry question about what is going to be the difference between today and one week from now, I have to admit, there is not going to be a tremendous progress. And I am phrasing this as carefully as possible but I have described a situation that -- I mean, I am working 18 hours a day, seven days a week. I have this one person who is now paid -- maybe I shouldn't say that here -- for four days and she is working six days and we are trying to keep everything together.

This will crumble at any point and at this point, yeah, I don't see -- I am saying that with just as plainly as possible, one week from now, there might be some progress.

G6L5murC conference

years.

Again, out of hundreds of names there be -- we already have a few names, obviously.

THE COURT: Obviously.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: Obviously. We are not talking about millions of pages of documents, we are talking about a few boxes of documents is what it sounds like to me. How many employees are we talking about?

THE DEFENDANT: Hundreds, your Honor.

THE COURT: A couple of hundred of employees. All right.

THE DEFENDANT: I think it is many more than that.

THE COURT: Many more than a couple hundred employees?

THE DEFENDANT: I think we are talking about five

MR. MEYER: Over a six-year window we are estimating, your Honor, that it is approximately 500.

THE COURT: Even that sounds high to me, but assuming that is to be the case, I think these are very discrete requests for information that, again, I ordered this in April and we are having this conversation now. So, it sounds like the decision has been made not to make this a priority, not to talk to one's lawyers and just sort of hope at the end of the day you can sort of claim hard luck and expect the Court is going to amend previously scheduled orders and I just think

conference

G6L5murC

that was a bad calculation. So.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, the assumption is not factual?

THE COURT: What assumption is not factual.

THE DEFENDANT: The assumption that by design we have not acted in order to collect these names. I have protested from the second Mr. Meyer informed me of your order. Where was I? Why didn't you tell me? And I would have voiced everything I am voicing now so that I would avoid to have such a tight calendar. The calendar itself —

THE COURT: Tight calendar? April to June 1st is a tight calendar?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Your Honor, the class was certified --

THE COURT: I guarantee you that I myself alone, knowing nothing about the documents, could have achieved this result in that amount of time doing it, frankly, from 9:00 until midnight every night. I guarantee you I could have done that. I am willing to stake my life on it. This is not that onerous and I gave you two months to do it, almost two months to do it and it hasn't been done and now you are telling me it is going to take many, many, more months on top of that.

We are going in circles here. Okay?

MR. MEYER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: So, obviously, you are displeased and I am

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

more than willing to live with that. I am displeased, too, and I assume the plaintiffs are also displeased. It is just life.

What did you want to say?

MR. MEYER: The relationship with Mr. LaJaunie has devolved to this singular discussion about the April conference and the extension of time or the duration of time to produce these documents.

> THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MEYER: That's what the relationship has devolved It is brought up every time we have a discussion about whether the documents are going to be produced. We should have asked for more time which I believe your Honor would state that we did, we asked for an exorbitant amount of time that was then cut down to this June 1 deadline.

This relationship has evaporated. As much as Mr. LaJaunie and I have worked together well and I believe we have in the past, we keep coming back to this one issue and there is no progress made as to producing these documents. I wish we could. I wish I had better news for you. I wish I had more information to tell plaintiff's counsel but we don't. This is what we are left with.

Hopefully in a week we have the documents and we can report some positive news but I just feel we are going to have the same conversation in a week. So, I would ask that our motion, you at least leave it open for conversation pending a

G6L5murC conference

result in the next week or so.

THE COURT: Yes, that's.

Fine. Look. If I ultimately end up granting a default judgment with respect to the corporate defendants and perhaps the individual defendant as well, then that will sort of take care of everything, won't it.

So, I guess I am inclined to give this a week because I'm confident that this could be done in a week if there was a will, and if there isn't a will, then we will deal with that when it happens.

Mr. Kirschenbaum, anything else you want to say on this?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Nothing further, your Honor.

I guess, do we reconvene in a week or just assume it is going to get done?

THE COURT: No, I guess I will ask for a status letter in a week.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Okay.

THE COURT: Then depending on what I get, I will issue an order -- bring everybody back in or issue an order to show cause as to why I shouldn't be sanctioning and perhaps even granting a judgment against the defendants for failure to comply with Court orders.

So, I think that's the speed we should be going in.

Okay? All right. If, in the meantime, there is some other

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lawyer who wants to come in, then let me know that too, but for now I am denying the motion to be removed as counsel.

Okay. So, a week from today puts us at the 28th, so I would like a letter from plaintiffs -- excuse me, from defendants by the 28th indicating where they are with that production, and then if you want to respond I will give you 24 hours to respond, Mr. Kirschenbaum. Okay?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's do that.

Is there anything else anybody would like to say? Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: May I ask a question?

What is the difference between the judgment and the How could it be a judgment before the trial? trial?

THE COURT: Here is the deal. I issued a court order in April. If a party tells me we are not complying with that court order, the heck with it, we can't or won't, have no intention of doing that and then don't, then I can sanction them by saying, well, until you do, I am going to hold you on the hook for some monetary penalties, or I can ultimately find against the defendant, I can find for the plaintiffs and issue a judgment against the defendants for failing to comply with the Court's orders and then we wouldn't have a trial, then there would just be a judgment.

> THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: And that judgment could be collected on and that would -- that might entail additional discovery, it might entail additional proceedings, I don't know, but there would be a judgment and there would be no trial at that point. So, we are not there yet but that is, I guess, the worst case scenario if my orders are not complied with, okay? THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor. THE COURT: Thanks very much. If anybody needs a copy of the transcript, you can take that up with the court reporter, either now or later through the website. Okay? Thank you.